



**North Area Committee
(City Councillors representing Arbury, King's
Hedges, East Chesterton and West Chesterton
Wards)
15 January 2004 7:30 – 10.00pm
Minutes & Actions**

Present: Councillors: Ian Nimmo-Smith (West Chesterton and Chair for part), Rhodri James, Mike Todd-Jones & Tim Ward (Arbury), Maria Bell, & Louise Downham (King's Hedges), Donald Adey & Jenny Bailey (East Chesterton and Chair), Max Boyce & Nichola Harrison (West Chesterton)

Also Present: County Councillor Julian Huppert (East Chesterton)

Action by

04/01 ELECTION OF CHAIR

Councillor Bailey was nominated by Councillor Nimmo-Smith and seconded by Councillor Boyce. Councillor Todd-Jones was nominated by Councillor Downham and seconded by Councillor Bell.

Councillor Bailey was elected by 5 votes to 3.

04/02 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

Councillor Ward was nominated by Councillor Nimmo-Smith and seconded by Councillor James, and elected unopposed.

04/03 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jennifer Liddle (East Chesterton) & Elizabeth Hughes (King's Hedges) and County Councillors Ian Kidman (Arbury) & Maurice Leeke (West Chesterton).

04/04 MINUTES

**ACTION
BY**

The minutes of 13 November 2003 were signed as a correct record and there were no matters arising.

04/05 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor James declared a prejudicial interest as a trustee of the Cambridge Churches Fund for Schools...He left the meeting during agenda item 04/08: Consultation on changes to the management of Joint Use Centres)

County Councillor Huppert declared a personal interest as a Governor of St Andrews School on the agenda item: Consultation on changes to the management of Joint Use Centres)

Councillors Todd-Jones and Ward declared personal interests as they lived near to the application premises 04/09 A.

04/06 OPEN FORUM

The following were raised by members of the public present (*answers given in italics*):

1) Regarding installation of double yellow lines and parking bays in Oak Tree Avenue.

A- County Councillor Huppert would raise the matter at the Cambridge Environment & Transport AJC on 26 January. Councillor Bailey would pursue the matter with officers generally and as an Environment Improvement project for the future.

Action by:
County Cllr
Huppert
and
Councillor
Bailey

2) The money allocated to the two projects in our area, the drainage problem at the Piazza and the landscaping between 38-40 Campkin Road - when will they be done??

A- Piazza drainage. We are seeking estimates for this work, and if all goes to programme the work should be carried out this spring. Campkin Road. This is out to Streetscene for price and implementation. The work should proceed this planting season - before the end of March.

Action by:
Helen
Hepburn,
Landscape
Architect.
01223
457134

3) The new play area on Nuns Way recreation Ground is great, but needs to be checked regularly for vandalism, and particularly dog faeces, which is being deposited on and around the equipment.

A- The childrens team will do a weekly risk assessment around the building / rec ground to highlight any issues . In the summer this will be increased to take account of more frequent reccy ranger sessions taking place . Issues are then forwarded to the rangers to deal with as appropriate. Streetscene check the play area 3 times a week. [NB further to the meeting it has been established that this information is incorrect. All play areas are inspected daily - this takes the form of a short visual inspection. There is subsequently a

fortnightly interim engineer's inspection with a monthly full inspection.]

4) CCTV in Mitcham's Corner, Victoria Road, Castle Hill, Chesterton Road area - what is the progress, what has happened to the assessment which was redone, where are the mobile cameras going and when??

A - Councillor Nimmo-Smith referred to the recent decisions taken (on 13 January) by him following the Commercial & Human Resources Scrutiny Committee, these covered deployment guidelines, evaluation criteria and prioritisation of the initial applications. See on the web through the link below, or on public deposit (its Agenda Item 6):

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/councillors/agenda/2004/0113chr.htm>

5) Can we have a statement on the progress towards reopening Cutter Ferry footbridge? This is a crucial link for us in East Chesterton and its closure is causing great inconvenience. The silence is leading people to conclude that nothing is happening and that as the bridge is not in the city centre no-one thinks it is worth bothering with.

A - County Councillor Huppert explained that it looked likely that the bridge could be repaired (rather than rebuilt) and if so this would be done as soon as possible. The repairs would take around 2 months.

He also mentioned that the County Council was to consult imminently on whether cycling should be allowed, as dual use with pedestrians, on the Fort St George and Green Dragon bridges.

Finally he stated that the new Riverside bridge would soon be the subject of a design competition, which would be featured in the local press.

6) Can you put cardboard in your green bin because some in East Chesterton have been told no.

A - Councillor Ward said that you can put cardboard in your green bin and he would find out why there had been incorrect advice given.

Action by:
Cllr Ward

7) Can we have an update on the deployment of the City Council Anti-social behaviour special beat officer?

A - Cllr Nimmo-Smith advised that the deployment was due to be made wider at some point in the future.

8) What is the current status of police community support officers for the four wards?

A - Cllr Nimmo-Smith advised that the Executive would be bidding for an additional two PCOs in the 2004/05 budget. This would be considered on 12 February by the Council.

9) Why does the Council demolish old buildings like the Old Chapel and Chesterton Hospital?

A- Cllr Nimmo-Smith explained the decisions taken on planning grounds and undertook to investigate if there were any discrepancies in the permission granted for the Hospital site and what is currently provided.

Action by:
Cllr
Nimmo-
Smith

The following questions were put in advance in writing and received a written response (in italics) below (officer contact Jon Finney 01223 457375):

9) Chesterton High Street 'improvements':

When are we going to see action on the very dangerous state of the footways in the High Street following the traffic calming works? The deep puddle outside the Haymakers close to the zebra crossing is a serious accident waiting to happen. When it rains there is only a foot width of space available on the outside edge of the pavement on which to walk without paddling. As this is also the narrowest part of the roadway it only a matter of time before a pedestrian is sideswiped by a passing vehicle with serious consequences. This has been notified to the officers on at least three occasions.

A - The problem with the footway outside the Haymakers is that in order to remove the puddle we have to adjust two boxes (manholes) that are in the ownership of the public utilities as yet we have not received permission to alter that level of the boxes. This office will again request the same. Failing this I will have a footway gully installed and piped into the adjacent grassed area, with a soak away.

When are the trees that died in the area from 90 to 116 High Street going to be replaced? When can we expect to see replacement trees planted further along the High Street towards the Green End Road end?

A - Any of the trees that were planted as part of the environmental improvement scheme are due to be replaced with similar sized specimens within this planting season (i.e. January/February this year).

When are the traffic calming works due to be restarted? When they are restarted can we have clearer marking of bollards and humps.

The cryptic colouring and lack of reflectors on the bollards make them hard to see at any time. The road humps disappear in wet weather and require chevrons to indicate where they are so that vehicles carrying fragile passengers can be slowed to an appropriate crawl to minimise discomfort to passengers.

A - The restarting of the improvement scheme outside the shops is dependant on developer funding. This has been negotiated and agreed, but as yet no payment have been made. Once the monies are available the works will re-start.

The bollards are in place to prevent motor vehicles from mounting the footway. All bollards are set back by 500mm from the kerb face to prevent any accidental damage from vehicles undertaking normal manoeuvres. The reflective strips are the minimum that are acceptable. Given the lowered speeds that vehicles should be traversing the road this should be sufficient. However, if there areas of particular concern this could be investigated for larger reflective plates (this clearly have a potential to be detriment to the visual effect of the scheme).

The materials used on the ramps carefully chosen to reflect the conservation areas vernacular architecture and not to conflict with the built environment. The decision not to mark the approach ramps was made as part of the overall design concept for the environmental improvement scheme. As the High Street is not part of a signed route, regular users should know the location of the speed reducing features and drive appropriately. Any non-locals will pass warning signs informing them that they have entered a traffic calmed area, again they should be prepared to meet physical features intended to reduce their speeds. If this involves significantly reducing their speeds then the measures will have been successful.

10) Consultation policies: The Old Chesterton Residents Association wishes to put on record its disappointment that in the recent consultation over the need to reopen access via St Andrews Road the majority response was disregarded. We are also concerned that members making the decision were reportedly swayed by reports of an accident which happened between a vehicle emerging from Logan's Way and a cyclist approaching from the east along St Andrews Road. The closure of the Elizabeth Way access was irrelevant to the circumstances of that accident.

A - The questioner was offered an answer in the form of an extract from the minutes Cambridge Environment & Transport Area Joint Committee (20.10.03):

150. REVIEW OF ST ANDREW'S ROAD CLOSURE

The Area Joint Committee considered the outcome of follow-up

consultation on the road closure of St Andrew's Road that had been introduced in September 2002. A majority of responses received had indicated a wish that the road be re-opened; however, responses received from residents of St Andrew's Road only had shown overwhelming support for the retention of the closure. No obvious impact on road safety had been observed.

Speaking as a Local Member, Councillor J Huppert reported that although there had been some requests for the road to be re-opened, local residents were strongly in favour of ~~the~~ retaining the closure. He felt that the measure had made the area safer and should be retained.

Other comments included:

- the need to respond to the majority view, which was in favour of re-opening the road. In addition, the closure was likely to be detrimental to local businesses
- the view, on the other hand, that the character of the area had changed with the departure of Philips and was now predominantly residential
- the view that the closure had created a safer through-route for cyclists

It was resolved

- i) to note the results of the public consultation; and
- ii) to support the retention of the road closure.

11) One question was not answered and Cllr Nimmo-Smith undertook to reply.

34 Victoria Road - what steps has the council taken to assess whether 34 Victoria Road is an appropriate site for a continuing drinkers hostel now that it has become apparent that the property does not have planning permission to be a hostel - and why was the notice served in the paper on Boxing Day and without notification to both MCRTA and Victoria Homes had had long consultations with David Greening about the project? Why does the council think that this ward, which has already absorbed many supported housing projects, is suitable to support this vulnerable group of people?

Action by:
Cllr
Nimmo-
Smith

A - The City Council Community Services Dept has been committed to providing accommodation for continuing drinkers for a number of years and has allocated money to provide a building since 1999. The problems of identifying a suitable site have caused this scheme to slip from year to year, and each year a much needed facility in our city goes unprovided.

34 Victoria Road was identified as a potentially suitable site by Community Services as it has been accommodating a complex client group with similar addiction issues since 1979. Our understanding was that the property had worked well for vulnerable client groups, had sufficient space for an office and 24 hour support with enough resident bedspaces for it to stack up financially.

The Planning issue under discussion is complex. The 1979 Planning consent stated that the use of 34 Victoria Road was restricted to that described in the application and accompanying letter and for no other use. The said letter stated that the building was to be used for a second stage of recovery for individuals who had prior treatment for alcohol dependency and are 'dry' on arrival. Accordingly drink on the premises was not to be tolerated either by staff or residents. The property has actually been used in the last few years to house people who are detoxifying from drug addiction. The 1979 planning consent was personal to Helping Hands (later to be known as Turning Point). This means that the consent is associated specifically with the organisation and not with the property and therefore when Turning Point stopped using the premises as a hostel, the Planning consent reverted to class 3 (dwelling house) status.

The planning application was publicised by the Planning Dept in the paper on Boxing Day along with details of other applications received just before Christmas. The Planning Dept took the view that the press notice should not be delayed as this would add to delay in dealing with the application. This decision was taken in the context of other means of neighbour consultation that Planning employ. All properties adjacent to the application site were notified automatically and the planning case officer decided to extend this notification zone following a site visit. This is common practice and ensures that those most effected are notified personally. A site notice was also displayed on the site on 6 January 2004. I also understand from David Greening (Community Services officer) that he has been keeping local residents and traders associations fully informed and last sent an email to the them about the planning consent issue on 30 December.

The City Council's Community Services Dept believes that this location is a good fit. It has many years history of operating as a home to vulnerable people who have had or have issues with alcohol and drugs (although the proposed project is not for drug users). It will only accommodate 6 residents and will have 24 hour staff support in place. The Council will have a contract with Cambridge Cyrenians who are the proposed provider of the scheme, which will set out clear boundaries doorstep/neighbourhood management and we believe the scheme

will unduly impact on local residents. However, it is important for me to point out that the City Council in its function as an independent Planning Authority, will assess the planning application for the project in the same way as any other and that the comments of all involved will be fully considered.

04/07 REVIEW OF PLANNING OBLIGATION STRATEGY: PROPOSED PROJECTS FOR FUNDING

Following discussion, the Committee agreed that minor changes be made to the table Informal Open Space (appendix B), putting as a higher priority the projects to improve lighting and the Arbury Court toilets. It was agreed that the revised list could be confirmed by Chair and spokes.

The Committee was advised that the timescale for completing the projects in the list would be between 5 to 10 years.

Resolved

In respect of Public Open Space:

The schedule of projects detailed and prioritised in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 and approved by Community Development and Leisure Committee on 31st January 2002 is endorsed *with the changes as agreed by the Area Committee incorporated following approval by Chair & Spokes.*

Action by:
John
Roebuck
Head of
Parks and
Recreation
01223
457531

The summarised position statement (appendix 4) of current projects is noted.

The Head of Parks and Recreation, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Leisure, Executive Councillor for Environment and the Chair of the North Area Committee, may consider adding new projects if appropriate and the changes reported to the relevant Area Committee.

In respect of Community Development

That retention of the projects listed in paragraph 3.9 is endorsed and that the new items in 3.9.2 are added to the list for further exploration and feasibility work.

04/08 CONSULTATION ON CHANGES TO THE MANAGEMENT OF JOINT USE CENTRES

A public question was put:

What will you do to ensure that the school community wings continue to be used for community activity as they are at present, if the Council is no longer running them?

The Head of Community Development stated that the Council would work with each school in partnership and services provided would be agreed thorough service level agreements.

In response to a concern from County Councillor Huppert re. St Andrews, the Head of Community Development stated that conditions would not be imposed on schools and agreed that St Andrews was not yet ready for any change because of other current issues at the school. The Committee agreed that it would not be appropriate to impose change, but to work with each school. Cllr Nimmo-Smith noted that the proposals for the five schools across the city were already moving at two speeds which showed the commitment to partnership.

04/09 A

Site Land rear of 14 Roseford Road, Arbury

Proposal Erection of one 4 bedroom house

Application No C/03/1062

Applicant Mr/Mrs Houlder and Mr/Mrs Secker, 14 Roseford Road

Public speakers Mr Houlder, 14 Roseford Road, Mr Tout 58 Hurrell Road.

The Planning Officer referred to an amendment sheet, which stated that the Environment Agency had commented that there was no record of flooding at the site. It stated that the proposed method of surface water drainage, via 'surface water soakaways' should not impact on the current reported flooding situation. The proper installation and control of such systems is controlled under building regulations. The Council was to seek confirmation from Anglian Water that the plans submitted under condition 6 are acceptable.

Members of the Committee expressed concern that there would be problems with access to the proposed property and that it was an over-development of the site bearing in mind the location.

Resolved (by 8 votes to 2)

To refuse the application (against the officer recommendation)

Sarah Dyer
(planning)
457153

Reasons for refusal to be based on Policies BE2 and HO5 and to relate to character of the area. Reasons for refusal to be agreed by Chair (Councillor Bailey) and Spokes (Councillor Todd-Jones).
Reasons for refusal as follows:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of the constrained arrangements for vehicular access, would result in increased manoeuvring of cars in close proximity to other vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists to the detriment of highway safety. In addition the restricted access arrangements would be likely to result in vehicles over-running the adjacent grassed area, resulting

in damage to the grass, thereby reducing the contribution which this area makes to the visual amenities and character of the area. In so doing the development fails to respect the character and constraints of the site and its surroundings. The application is therefore contrary to policies HO5 and BE2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996).

2. The proposed development does not make provision for public open space and community facilities in accordance with the Planning Obligations Strategy, which was adopted as supplementary planning guidance July 2002. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policies RL3 and CS3 of the Cambridge Local Plan (1996).

B

Site [Chesterton Recreation Ground, Church Street, East Chesterton](#)

Proposal Demolition of existing skateboard ramp (10.21x4.88m), construction of new half-pipe skateboard ramp at new area of recreation ground adjacent to existing play area.

Application No C/03/1117

Applicant Director of Community Services, Cambridge City Council

Public speakers Mr Pinney, 12 Manor Cottages, Church Street, Mr Bond, Old Chesterton Residents Association, Mr Szummer, 36 Longworth Avenue

Resolved (by 9 votes to 0)

To approve the application subject to conditions as listed in the report.

C

Site [Recreation Ground at, Scarsdale Close, East Chesterton](#)

Proposal Erection of a single storey youth and community centre and landscape improvements (update following decision of 6 October 2003).

Application No C/03/0600

Applicant Head of Community Development, Cambridge City Council

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)

To approve the application subject to conditions as listed in the report.

D

Site [11 Montgomery Road, Arbury](#)

Proposal Variation of condition 2 of planning permission ref:C/88/1341 to enable garage to be used as accomodation ancillary to main dwelling house.

Application No C/03/1112

Applicant A Rajforali, 126 George Street, Oban

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)

To approve the application subject to conditions as listed in the report.

E

Site [11a Garry Drive, Kings Hedges](#)

Proposal Conversion of existing storage building into 2No. residential units.

Application No C/03/1217

Applicant Mr K Webb, 11a Garry Drive

Resolved (by 8 votes to 0)

To refuse the application and to instruct the Head of Legal & Democratic Services to undertake enforcement action as detailed in the report.

The meeting ended at 10.00pm.

CHAIR